

Trevino et al.

S/N: 09/683,129

In the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings replace all original sheets. Drawings changes have been made to Figures 9 and 14.

In Fig. 9, reference character 263 has been added as described in the specification.

In Fig. 14, reference character 322 was modified to correct a typographical error.

No new matter has been added.

Drawing Attachments: Two Replacement Sheets of drawings

Trevino et al.

S/N: 09/683,129

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the present application. In the Final Office Action mailed September 20, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 10-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Banks et al. (USP 6,674,449). The Examiner next rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Banks et al. in view of Pavey et al. (USP 5,530,907).

Claim 31 was objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended claim 31 to depend from claim 30.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "322" in the specification [0087], line 5 and "328" have both been used to designate application parameters. The drawings are also objected as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign mentioned in the description: "263" in Fig 9. Replacement sheets of drawings are attached correcting the objected to subject matter. As such, Applicant requests withdrawal of the drawing objections.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Banks et al. (hereinafter Banks) in view of Pavey et al. The rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) cannot be maintained because the application and Banks are commonly owned. That is, Banks and the current application were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment, to the same entity. Banks is assigned to GE Medical Systems Global Technology Company, as is the current application; the assignment of which has been recorded at Reel/Frame #012533/0852. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 under §103(a).

Applicant has canceled claims 10-15.

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Banks. Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests reconsideration.

Banks teaches identifying images required by a medical professional and providing a separate icon (workflow icons) for each required image within space 278. See col. 13, lines 4-14. When the icons are selected, parameter values and tools corresponding to the image type are provided in space 282. See col. 13, lines 26-31 and col. 14, lines 18-20. Banks teaches that "[o]nce the patient is properly positioned and all of the parameter values are properly set, the technologist selects an accept icon 312 indicating to the imaging system that a localizer image should be generated." Col. 14, lines 6-9. The technologist may also select the accept icon 312 to generate a series of images corresponding to the desired protocol for the other required images. See col. 14, lines 24-29.

Trevino et al.

S/N: 09/683,129

The Examiner stated that "Figs. 5-10 explicitly teaches a plurality of icons representing a plurality of application steps (256, 258, 260, 252, 284, 286, 288, and 290), wherein said selection of each application step selector must send a command to the CPU for acquiring an MR image." *Office Action, supra at p. 10.* The Examiner further stated, "For example, selecting (284), (286), (288), and (290) results in acquisition of an MR image. . ." *Id.* Applicant disagrees. As stated above, selecting a workflow icon does not send a command to the CPU for acquiring an MR image as the Examiner stated, but instead provides parameter values and tools in space 282.

Banks fails to teach or suggest receiving a prescription command and acquiring MR images in response to the received prescription command for an application step as called for in claim 16. While selection of the accept icon may indicate to the imaging system that an image should be generated, Banks does not teach or suggest that selection of the accept icon causes a computer to receive a prescription command. Furthermore, the Examiner associated an imaging prescription command with the localizer icon 284 by example. *Office Action, supra at p. 10.* However, as stated above, selecting one of the workflow icons does not cause an MR image to be acquired in response to selection of the workflow icon. Instead, selecting a workflow icon causes parameter values and tools to be provided in space 282.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 16 and the claims that depend therefrom are believed to be patentable over the prior art.

The Examiner rejected claims 25 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Banks. Applicant respectfully disagrees that claim 32 is anticipated by Banks. Applicant has amended claim 25 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 32.

Amended claim 25 calls for displaying a number of status indicators on the GUI, the number of status indicators configured to indicate completion of a prescription step. Such is not taught or suggested in Banks.

Banks teaches that "[e]ach of the workflow icons includes a virtual button and an LED illustration which, when the icon is selected, lights up. For example, localizer icon 284 includes LED illustration 292." *Col. 13, lines 12-15.* Thus, Banks teaches that the LED lights up when the workflow icon is selected.

The Examiner stated, "Each of the workflow icons includes a virtual button and an LED illustration (292) which when the icon is selected, lights up. . ." *Office Action, supra at p. 17.* The Examiner concluded that "[s]aid LED illustration is a status indicator, which correlates with the prescription tabs." *Id.* Further, the Examiner stated, "It would also make sense to turn off the

Trevino et al.

S/N: 09/683,129

LED (292) when [the LOCALIZER (284)] imaging session is completed. Since LEDS are not designed to stay on indefinitely, completion of said imaging session must turn off the LED." *Id.*

Banks does not teach displaying a number of status indicators on the GUI, the number of status indicators configured to indicate completion of a prescription step as called for in claim 25. While the Examiner concluded that it would make sense to turn off the LED when the imaging session is completed, Banks merely teaches lighting up the LED when the respective workflow icon is selected. That is, an LED in the on state merely indicates that the associated workflow icon is selected. Banks does not teach that turning off the LED indicates completion of a prescription step. Banks does not teach that user is required to complete a scan once a workflow icon is selected. That is, a user may make multiple workflow icon selections before completing a scan corresponding to a workflow icon. Selecting another workflow icon before completing a corresponding scan for one workflow icon will turn off the LED corresponding to the one workflow icon indicating its de-selection, not its completion. Therefore, Banks does not anticipate displaying a number of status indicators on the GUI, the number of status indicators configured to indicate completion of a prescription step.

The Examiner further stated that "[i]n addition, Fig. 3 explicitly teaches a 'complete status' for each exam, which specifically is a status indicator to indicate a completion of task . . ." *Office Action, supra at p. 17.* However, claim 25 calls for a number of status indicators to indicate completion of a prescription step, not completion of a task or imaging session as shown in Fig. 3.

Therefore, for at least those reasons, claim 25 and the claims that depend therefrom are believed to be patentable over the prior art.

Claim 30 has been amended to correct antecedent basis in light of the amendment to claim 25.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-9, 16-25, 27, and 29-31.

Trevino et al.

S/N: 09/683,129

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,



Kent L. Baker
Registration No. 52,584
Phone 262-376-5170 ext. 15
klb@zpspatents.com

Dated: November 21, 2005
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.108

P.O. ADDRESS:

Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
14135 North Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53097-1416
262-376-5170